HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 45 Monday, November 10, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

NOV 13 1958

GOP: *How it can recover* .....(page 1)

ANALYSIS: *Behind the debacle*.....(page 2)

RIGHT TO WORK: *The long road back*.....(page 3)

ARIZONA: *Reuther meets his match*.....(page 4)

THE SOUTH: *Conservatives on the march*....(page 4)

What Happened, Why and the Lesson: Among working politicos and party strategists in the Capital, a fresh view of what happened at the polls last Tuesday transcends in importance the intricate statistical analyses of various states, speculation on whether or not machine bosses knifed the ticket, and comparative shades of success and failure among Modern Republicans, middle-of-the-roaders and right-wing candidates.

The startling, and unstressed, fact about the election is this: with all the intimidation and pressures that the labor bosses could generate, with one million shop stewards and other officials getting out the vote at the precinct level, the Democrats still netted only 56 per cent of the Nation's total vote.* The GOP, stifled by six years of lifeless "me-tooism," and handicapped at the precinct level by its reliance upon often undependable volunteers, still got 44 per cent. The conclusion arrived at by political strategists: with just a little of the leadership, planning and manpower that could have been made available by the business community, the GOP would have won handily.

Here are the facts which produced this conclusion, and the reasons why the Republicans' 44 per cent looms so large in the consciousness of political Washington:

Vice President Nixon, now the head of the Republican party in all but name, capsulized much Capital thinking on the morrow of defeat when he said: "The great lesson of this election for both Democrats and Republicans is that in these days campaigning is a year around business. *Republicans worked for two months and our opponents worked for two years.* The result was inevitable. However, we shall not make this mistake again. We shall begin working tomorrow for the victory which will be ours in November, 1960."

The political scientists who know their precincts assent to the Nixon view and offer a hopeful survey of Republican prospects. The 56-44 division of the vote is significant in view of certain peculiarities of the American electoral system. Because Republican strength is light in the South, and correspondingly heavy outside it, the GOP doesn't need to get 50-plus per cent of the total national vote in order to win a majority of the seats in Congress. Political statisticians put the necessary percentage at 48.5 per cent. On this basis, the GOP can win if its precinct workers dig up only five percentage points more in Republican votes than they did last week.

Capital pros say that this can be done by study and adoption of methods by which the "labor boss" organizations won last week. For, the smart boys in the Capital observe: "THIS WAS NOT A DEMOCRATIC VICTORY, IT WAS A LABOR-BOSS VICTORY." *Everyone in Washington today is talking about the phenomenal performance of COPE, the political arm of the AFL-CIO.*

HUMAN EVENTS, with a long background of study of COPE, and from up-to-the-minute reports from correspondents in the field, can report the following:

● It is known that COPE, nine months ago, had finished preparing its plans for getting out the labor vote: not statements of general principles, but detailed diagrams for every individual precinct in the country outside of the Solid South, down to the names of the organizers assigned to each precinct and the precinct's voter registration list.

● Nearly all the international unions held schools last winter showing union officials all the way down to the local level how to register every union member and his wife. Members who failed to register had their names posted "in disgrace" on union bulletin boards and were fined. In some locals, the amount set was $3; in others, as high as $15. Unions which registered 100 per cent of their members and their wives were recognized as "honor locals." Union officials who did not get 100 per cent registrations were called on the carpet and sometimes summarily replaced. In short, ruthless discipline.

● Doorbell ringing, telephone drives and leaflet distributions were going full blast throughout September and October. Car pools and baby sitters were available for every union voter; poll watchers and aggressive electioneers at factory gates were also turned out for Election Day duty.

Intimidation has become standard operating procedure to the labor bosses. Any worker who carried auto stickers favoring right-to-work or Knowland, Bricker or Goldwater might find smashed fenders or yellow paint splashed on his car.

● Getting voters to the polls was only the climax of labor's effort. The brainwashing to get the worker and his family to vote as ordered began the day he joined the union. Labor's publications (circulation,

*These percentages are based on early voting tabulations for 40 of the 48 states (Alaska has not yet balloted). They are derived from the figures for Senatorial elections in 32 states, and for gubernatorial elections in eight others. House percentages were not available at press time.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

19,000,000) go regularly to every member—filled with class-hate and the advocacy of socialistic programs. From the first column to the last, they smeared and ridiculed all Republican candidates—excepting the most slavishly "pro-labor."

Nevertheless, the extraordinary fact is that despite this enormous effort, Republicans polled 44 per cent of the total vote—and probably could have polled much more than 50 per cent if their side had been prepared with even a fraction of the union push.

Every pro in the Capital knows just where the "push" necessary to obtain the few extra percentage points is located. It is in the business community, already in ferment over the matter of whether or not business should engage in political activity, and if so, how.

An outstanding American industrialist, Sterling Morton of the Morton Salt Company, writes HUMAN EVENTS: "Most corporation officials have little, if any, ownership in the business and seem personally interested in keeping clear of controversies and dreaming of the 65th birthday when they will be relieved of worries and retire on a nice pension. If you agree with this premise, you must agree that they and the companies they serve are 'sitting ducks' for militant labor leaders.

"Unless and until major corporation executives realize that they have a duty to the economic system which produces their jobs as well as to the particular organizations they serve, the growth of socialism will undoubtedly continue."

This picture, we can report, confronts a large number of company officials and directors who are now, since the election, thoroughly awake. For emergency meetings of such figures have been called in Washington this week; and not just to draft resolutions, adopt them and then file them away. One of those holding such a meeting summoned his colleagues with the remark: "This is the most important meeting since the year 1946 [when the Taft-Hartley Act was first proposed]."

Election—Basic Meaning: The root causes of the failure of the Republicans spring readily to minds and lips on Capitol Hill. Noted first of all is the failure of the Eisenhower Administration, from V-Day in November, 1952, to give expression to the "constituency" which gave it victory—namely, the group which is frequently referred to as the "right wing," but which is actually the bulk of the party rank and file.

After Taft came to the rescue of the Ike ticket in September, 1952 (when Ike was "running like a dry creek") and insured its victory, the policy of the new Administration was gradually shifted to the left, to Modern Republicanism, and finally and fatally, after the '56 elections, to outright repudiation of conservatism and backing for a welfare state. "Government with a heart," said Ike. Then, at the eleventh hour in October, came Ike's "new look." It came too late; such is the verdict on Capitol Hill.

"If Ike had talked and acted for six years in harmony with his words in the last 30 days," runs Capital comment, "the election outcome last Tuesday would have been radically different."

Another basic cause of the debacle is heard more frequently in the Capital than it is in the columns of the pundits. It is typified in the *obiter dictum*: "The defeat was the inevitable result of six years of Ike, and of five years, ten months of Sherman Adams." Until his resignation, scant weeks before the election, the sinister "modern" from New Hampshire guided Ike in a policy which often seemed to be deliberately aimed at wrecking the Republican party. Sparing patronage went to Republicans, generous appointments to Democrats; still other Democrats were simply left in their positions, holdovers from the Truman regime, as if nothing had changed. Snubbing and rough treatment for old party faithfuls was the rule rather than the exception. A little spirit returned in the "eleventh-hour conversion" during recent weeks, but too little to effect a real revival of GOP morale.

Meanwhile, Ike during his terms avoided public association with "Republicanism" and his strategists ignored or played down the party as a factor in the regime. "Ike owes nothing to the GOP," was their attitude; "the party owes its victory to Ike." This extraordinary course came to a climax in the "victory celebration" of November, 1956, when Ike failed even to mention the party, and the long GOP telecast on election evening did not mention a single Republican save Ike and Nixon. The White House directors deliberately omitted throwing the spotlight on Senators, Members of Congress, or gubernatorial candidates. (The Democrats, even in the days of their "personality cult" adulation for FDR, never committed this cardinal sin.) The lion's share of Republican funds went to building up the campaign and the glory of Ike, with short rations for hard-pressed congressional candidates. No wonder the GOP lost the congressional elections, while Ike coasted in.

Finally, on the crucial and decisive issue—defeat of the labor bosses—the Administration to the last ducked and rabbited. Ike stood "above the battle"; Nixon remained visibly, if silently, unsympathetic to the struggle against compulsory unionism; Secretary of Labor Mitchell remained militantly and openly against the right to work. A muddled and blurred strategy on this matter contributed heavily to defeat.

WHAT IT PROVED: Surveying it from every angle, election analysts say that the crushing defeat of the GOP cannot be sifted into any comprehensible political pattern. Conservatives like Bricker and "moderns" like Kean went down in ruin together; while other contrasting figures, such as conservative Senator Goldwater and "liberal" Representative Hugh Scott, rode to victory.

At the House level, large and predominantly conservative GOP delegations (as in California and upstate New York) held their own very well. Some "modern" delegations—as in Connecticut—were completely wiped out, but others (for example, New Jersey) pulled through in every district.

After four days of trying to make it fit, the politicos conclude that the Republicans lost for reasons of organizational technique, lack of funds, insufficient effort at the precinct level and wobbling campaign strategy. The scythe of the labor machine, which is expert in all of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the areas where the GOP is inept, cut down "moderns" and conservatives alike.

As always, the "liberals" in the press corps are trying to make the election look like an endorsement of the White House brand of Republicanism. If there is any merit in this kind of argument, say the vote tabulators, it is all in the other direction. Fourteen Republican Senatorial candidates, beginning with Payne of Maine in September, went under in the 1958 elections. Of these, only five—Barrett, Bricker, Handley, Malone and Steinle—chose to stake their political lives on conservatism. One, Hoblitzell, had established no significant record. The remaining eight were either out-and-out "liberals" or Senators who had become known for their eager services to the White House: Kean, Knight, Payne, Potter, Purtell, Revercomb, Thye, Watkins. The tally shows "modern" losers ahead of conservatives by eight to five.

● If there was one thing that last week's results were *not*—agree politicos—it was a "mandate for spending." This confusion was introduced into post-election analysis by President Eisenhower himself, when he told newsmen he thought the public had elected so many Democrats because of "apathy" toward spending.

Many in the Capital laud the President's own words of enmity toward the spenders, but discount his dissection of the election results. First of all, they note, Ike's own Administration has set new records in the spending department, which has led the public at large—Democrats and Republicans alike—to identify the GOP with continued high taxes and inflation.

Second, there is accumulating evidence that many conservative Republicans contributed to the GOP debacle by splitting off from the regular ticket (as in Utah) or by staying at home (as in Michigan), or because they have felt that the GOP has spurned their views on economy in Government. In Wisconsin, super-spender Proxmire was able to taunt the GOP by pointing out instances in which congressional Republicans—dancing to the White House tune—had voted for spending bills. While this element could not alone have produced the Democratic sweep, it is reckoned as an important contributing factor in many areas.

AFTERMATH: The rise of Nelson Rockefeller has sharpened the basic struggle for control of the party. In the 1950-52 years, uncertainty whether Eisenhower would run, and delay on the part of Senator Taft in announcing his intentions, hobbled conservative chances to thwart the "moderns." Today, limned against the national scene, it is Rockefeller against Nixon for 1960. Nixon now stands far ahead.

The grass roots see—even if the metropolitan Eastern papers do not—that Rockefeller as a factor in 1960 must carry the liabilities of the people "who put him over": (1) Dewey, the kingmaker, who from the vantage point of Governor of New York dictated the nomination of Ike over Taft and his grass-roots support, and who shares the "let's be ashamed of the GOP" policy of Sherman Adams; (2) Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, far left-wing Democrat and official public relations counsel to the Rockefellers, played a big role in what is being called the "Rockefeller blitz"; (3) the "liberal" New York press, from *The New York Times* to the left-wing *New York Post*. The latter newspaper's publisher, Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, did not conceal her admiration for Rockefeller's "liberalism" during the campaign; she came out briefly for Harriman—probably to pay lip service to Democratic regularity—then withdrew support from the Governor in a dramatic eleventh-hour gesture, tying her decision to the issue of Zionism. GOP gravedigger Dewey, left-wing Democrat Rosenberg, and the far-left *New York Post* are facts which the grass roots have two years to ponder.

The Capital notes that Rockefeller, shortly after the election, was to depart for a vacation at his ranch in Venezuela, where he controls an oil company and numerous other properties. He is further engaged in a philanthropic enterprise there in conjunction with the Marxist-dominated revolutionary Government. Washington will observe closely the reception given Rockefeller in this Communist-infested nation, with an eye to comparing it with the Red-engineered abuse hurled at Vice President Nixon.

Right to Work: The observation prevalent in right-to-work quarters, disappointed by the loss of right-to-work referenda in five of six states, is: "the fight has just begun." For, taking stock of the situation and the varying problems of the six campaigns, the advocates of voluntary unionism know how they won in one instance and how they lost in the others. Next time, they affirm, with the proper tactics, they will push it over.

In Idaho, where the proposal lost, a right-to-work leader told HUMAN EVENTS that the agents of the labor bosses won the referendum by doorbell-ringing of a high order. Three months before the referendum, COPE put 50 highly skilled, presentable agents in the field, lining up people, registering them, getting them to the polls.

The right-to-work organization depended mainly on propaganda, pamphlets, news stories, *etc.* The organization completely abandoned the field of "personal" contact. The result was, according to our informants, that from 70,000 to 100,000 people who might well have voted against compulsory unionism did not vote at all.

● On the other hand, another largely agricultural state, Kansas, gave the right to work a comfortable majority. There an *ad hoc* Right-to-Work organization—not a chamber of commerce—was set up and over a period of years explained and elucidated a law which many people had not understood. Above all, state-wide organization (in major part utilizing farm-organization personnel) did the counterpart of doorbell ringing in the rural areas. Much enthusiasm resulted. One Kansan told us: "I saw one farmer who printed 'vote yes on right to work' on a hillside field, with his tractor and harrow."

GOP Congressman Wint Smith, of the Sixth District, won re-election running on the right-to-work issue. "If I hadn't run on that issue," Smith told HUMAN EVENTS, *"I would have lost by 10,000 votes." This sort of organization, this sort of publicity, offset the intensive block-by-block work of the COPE men in the cities.*

● The best picture which HUMAN EVENTS obtained from correspondents and by long-distance phone—illuminating the riddle of "why did the people reject right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to work?"—came from Ohio. There, right-to-work technicians said in substance:

"It wasn't lack of money, it was lack of organization in the precincts. Let me say that again—it was not lack of money at the end of the campaign, but at the beginning, many months ago. We had plenty of money in the last 30 days, but it was too late to put it to good use.

"We had time to spend our money only on propaganda and publicity. We weren't there in the precincts and polling places. COPE boys were there and had prepared long ago. They got their people named 'watchers and challengers' at the booths, and thus paid for by the union treasuries. Instructions to union men were simple and direct: 'Vote Democratic, Vote No [on right-to-work].'

"Meanwhile, business, which was ready to put up its money too late, and the regular politicos hampered us. The former preferred to send checks (as their nervous-nelly attorneys advised them) to Citizens for Eisenhower in New York, pathetically hoping it would do some good on the pavements of Ohio. Meanwhile, the GOP politicos (who knew we had no vote-getting machinery) did not want to have a collision with the labor forces.

"What little organization we had was composed of amateurs and we had little time to train any of them. When the board of the right-to-work organization voted to disband the day after the defeat, I said: 'I suppose they expect to start another campaign next year or the year after, filled with amateurs who do not know what to do and who do it too late.' Those business in politics seminars had better grapple with this situation."

What it Takes to Win: Standing free of the wreckage of last Tuesday's smash up is Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater, who trounced a formidable, Reuther-backed opponent, Governor Ernest McFarland, in his successful re-election bid. Post-election analysis of the Goldwater triumph over the massive opposition of the Reuther forces reveals sharp contrasts between his campaign and those of numerous GOP losers:

● Goldwater is an articulate, colorful campaigner. He goes on record firmly on issues, is not afraid to call the shots on his opponents and their functionaries—giving names, dates and places. He pulls no punches. Many GOP candidates in this election were hampered either by timidity, by lack of appeal as personalities, by hesitancy on key issues—or by a combination of these.

● He had behind him a firmly united party. There was no divisive element in the Arizona GOP, either openly or covertly applying the knife to its candidates —as happened in such states as California and Indiana.

● He had a hard-working, enthusiastic organization, that met the labor bosses on their own ground, and fought them to a standstill. The enthusiasm of the Goldwater forces for the fray was spurred by the Senator's own courage in blasting COPE irregularities and general Democratic connivings.

● Finally, Goldwater had one important asset which few Republicans—even such important ones as Knowland—could count on: influential press support. The two Phoenix papers, owned by conservative publisher Eugene Pulliam, supported Goldwater editorially and, even more important, reported news about labor activities in the state which normally gets buried in most "liberal" journals.

(In the wake of his impressive victory, Senator Goldwater is being prominently mentioned in the Capital for a top position in the Republican line up in the Senate —either as Minority Leader or in some other important position in the GOP hierarchy.)

Southern Elections: Election results in the South confirm that region's status as an unyielding bastion of conservatism. Considered as the most astounding upset in Dixie was the victory of an "independent," Dr. Dale Alford, over the "moderate" Representative Brooks Hays of Little Rock, Arkansas. Alford announced his write-in candidacy only a week before the election, charging that Hays' stand on "civil rights" could only lead to capitulation by the South. That he should receive more than 30,000 write-in votes with less than a week's campaigning against a seasoned legislator is considered a "political miracle" in the Capital, and is taken as further evidence that the South will not acquiesce to Federal encroachments.

● Also significant was the re-election of all five GOP Congressmen from the Confederate states—in contrast to the party's debacle in other sections of the Nation. For Republican circles in Washington know that they win in these normally Democratic districts only by maintaining conservative records, thus getting the right-wing Democratic vote.

In the vote compilations of the far-left Americans for Democratic Action, the five Southern Republicans chalked up the following percentages in the last session: Cramer (Fla.), 83 per cent conservative; Jonas (N.C.), 100 per cent; Alger (Tex.), 100 per cent; Poff (Va.), 92 per cent; and Broyhill (Va.), 67 per cent.

L. RICHARD GUYLAY, former Public Relations Director for the Republican National Committee: "I have followed HUMAN EVENTS since the beginning and always found it stimulating and—incidentally—extremely well written. Would that all other publications could say the same."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 45 HUMAN EVENTS November 10, 1958

Article Section I

WE CAN'T HAVE FREEDOM WITHOUT CAPITALISM

By HAROLD B. WESS

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, in a news conference, July 17, 1957, had this to say about his "many long discussions about our respective doctrines" with Soviet Marshal Zhukov: "I was very hard put to it when he insisted that their system appealed to the idealistic, and we completely to the materialistic, and I had a very tough time trying to defend our position. . . ."

Later in the conference, in answer to a question by one of the newspapermen, the President added: " . . . they ask these people to believe that their greatest satisfaction in life is in sacrificing for the state."

President Eisenhower is not alone in this confusion. Millions of Americans—including statesmen, politicians, college professors, teachers and students—have a blurred image of our society.

Since the meeting with General Eisenhower, Zhukov has been fired—despite his great contribution to "the state." He is lucky to be alive, and since under communism he cannot own anything, he is entirely at the mercy of the state.

This "state" which Zhukov described as "idealistic" makes it impossible for him to find work in some private industry because there is no private industry. The "new class" of bureaucrats and commissars described by Milovan Djilas owns everything. In our country a general who retires can seek and does often find employment in private industry. He can and does go into business for himself. He can and usually does own a home and a car. He quite often has savings with which he can do what he pleases.

On the basis of Zhukov's own experience, then, which doctrine is the more "idealistic"?

What we need is an economic psychiatrist who will dig out, from the sewage of our subconscious minds, all the ugly things that the enemies of capitalism have implanted there. We will then stop apologizing for the word "capitalism." The fact that we have to resort to such phrases as "modern capitalism," "controlled capitalism," "enlightened capitalism," "people's capitalism," is evidence enough that we somehow think that "capitalism" is a naughty word. Talking about "modern capitalism" is like talking about "modern humanity." It is a device used by the enemies of capitalism and by its weak-kneed apologists. Of course capitalism is modern. It is modern because it is a system which is dynamic, flexible, and free to develop and evolve.

Socialism and communism—like all forms of dictatorship—are frozen societies. The Nazis believed that they had achieved a society which would last a thousand years. The Communists believe the same. They believe that they have a system which is the ultimate in perfection and which will last forever. None of these systems tolerates any authentic change. Since change is the only constant in life, these systems must ultimately collapse or wither.

Capitalism, on the other hand, is a way of life which has in it the inherent ingredients of growth and change. Capitalism adjusts to changing times and changing conditions. Because of its fundamental principles, capitalism makes possible peaceful revolutions like the change in the pattern of income distribution.

WHAT, BASICALLY, is capitalism? Shorn of economic jargon, capitalism is a social order in which the individual has the inherent right to own property and capital and the right to pass it on to his children and others. It is a social and economic system where the individual is free to own property, free to work for himself or others, free not to work for the Government, free to choose his employer, his job or his vocation.

John Locke in the 17th century said that there are three primary natural rights, "life, liberty and property." So long as the individual's livelihood is entirely dependent on the state, be it socialist dictatorship or Communist, he is automatically denied these natural rights of "life, liberty and property." That is the reason why only under capitalism can a man be free and be master of his own life.

When a government becomes the sole owner of all property and tools of production the political bureaucracy will use every means to continue to enjoy its ownership. Djilas points this out in *The New Class* when he says: "It has been impossible in practice to separate police authority from judicial authority. Those who arrest also judge and enforce punishment. The circle is closed; the executive, the legislative, the investigative, the court, and the punishing are one and the same."

In addition to this total power, the Communist dictatorship also uses ideology, indoctrination and propaganda in order to enslave the people and make sure that nothing will happen to deprive them of their ownership. As Djilas observes: "Tyranny over the mind is the most complete and brutal type

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of tyranny; every other tyranny begins and ends with it." The sad story of what happened recently to Nobel Prize-winner Boris Pasternak serves to underline this fact.

The crucial point about capitalism is that with ownership in the hands of individuals, rather than in the hands of government, such government tyranny is impossible. There is no greater power than that of a government which owns and controls everything. Once a government bureaucracy holds complete ownership it will exert power and propaganda in order to continue to enjoy its ownership.

We miss the whole point of the freedom inherent in capitalism when we emphasize the high productivity and high standard of living of our system as evidence of its superiority to other systems. High productivity and superior standards of living are the result of our freedom! Our success as a capitalist society is the fruit of the incentives of a free people. The Communists promise to outproduce us. They also hold out a promise to their people of a better standard of living in the never-never land of the future. Even if they succeed, and I doubt it, their people will still be the pawns of the state, the slaves they are now.

These are the facts President Eisenhower should have pointed out to Zhukov. That is why capitalism is truly idealistic and communism crass materialism. A slave state may be able to build a pyramid or a sputnik in a comparatively short time as measured by history, but in the long run it must decay from the lack of the individual's urge to create and to express himself.

THERE ARE MANY kinds of social and economic societies in the world today, and it must be evident to any unprejudiced mind that the most advanced societies, in terms of the freedom of the individual, are predominantly capitalist. I say "predominantly capitalist" because most of the capitalistic societies have allowed a socialist component to be introduced into the economic system. Unfortunately the United States, too, has fallen prey to this trend. Nevertheless, the societies where capitalism outweighs the socialistic components have greater freedom, virility and growth, and a higher standard of living than their more collectivized competitors.

In this connection, let us remember that excessive taxation is a form of socialism. What the individual earns through his own efforts is being taken away from him by the Government, thus further strengthening the centralized bureaucracy. It also means that the individual is less and less able to invest his savings in stocks, bonds, real estate and other savings media, so that he becomes more and more dependent on the Government. The time can come when the Government might take away even the last remnant of his savings, as Soviet Russia has done from time to time by forcing its people to turn over their money in exchange for new, devalued currency. This could very easily happen in our country when the Government debt becomes too high.

We tend to delude ourselves into the belief that total socialism, which is really communism, will not come to us. But so prominent a socialist as Norman Thomas is quoted in the Congressional Record (April 17, 1958, p. A3080), as follows: "The United States is making greater strides toward socialism under Eisenhower than even under Roosevelt, particularly in the fields of Federal spending and welfare legislation."

A question arises as to why neither party has been willing or able to check this trend. Obviously it is due to the pressure from the entrenched bureaucracies already in power, the desire to secure votes through reckless spending of taxpayers' money, and the failure to appreciate fully our drift toward socialism.

In a mixed economy such as ours—part socialist but predominantly capitalist—the socialist part lives off the fat supplied by the capitalist segment. The process of this erosion is gradual and almost imperceptible. We are therefore unaware of the gradual shift—from a predominantly capitalist to a predominantly socialist society. If this process is not halted there will be no fat to live off and we shall find ourselves with a powerful, centralized socialist bureaucracy in complete control.

In a capitalist society the individual has the inherent right to own capital and property, and to pass it on to others; he is free to work for himself or others, free to choose his job or vocation, free not to work for the Government; he is assured of his personal freedom, he is assured of his God-given power of self-determination and he is protected from arbitrary control by a centralized bureaucracy. Let us keep our vision clear, for: "Where there is no vision, the people perish" (Proverbs 29:18).

Professor Wess, a former Vice President of R. H. Macy & Co., is a well-known author and lecturer on economic subjects. He is now the Program Director of the School of Business Administration, The American University, Washington, D. C. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Case For Immediate Tax Reduction," March 31, 1958.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "WE CAN'T HAVE FREEDOM WITHOUT CAPITALISM," at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 45 HUMAN EVENTS November 10, 1958

Article Section II

LEFT-WING FOLLIES: 1958 VERSION

Why Liberals Trying to "Sell" America Are Selling It Short

By FREDERIC NELSON

IN ONE OF his essays, Arnold Toynbee, the expert performer of autopsies on civilizations, predicts a long life for "sheltered civilizations, like those of the Tibetans and the Eskimos." But, Dr. Toynbee hastens to add, " 'sheltered' means, of course, sheltered from the dangers arising from human folly and wickedness, not sheltered from the rigors of the physical environment."

The faithful newspaper reader these days can hardly escape the conclusion that, when it comes to exposure to human folly and wickedness, the USA is practically naked. Leaving wickedness out of it on account of the libel laws, I should like to submit a few choice exhibits in folly—or anyway fat-headedness, naiveté and defeatism—as samples of what can happen to a Great People when dementia praecox sets in.

The bombardment of Quemoy, of course, flushed out some horrible cases of folly posing as "reason in the midst of hysteria." Leading this dubious parade was Senator Wayne Morse's unique suggestion that Secretary of State Dulles should be impeached for defending the security of the United States and the querulous "free world." Communist propaganda could use that one. The Reds got able assistance from columnist Walter Lippmann, who wants to "negotiate" the islands back to Red China. Lippmann says that Formosa itself would be "neutralized and demilitarized"—and (get this from a Great Humanitarian!) "the bulk of the mainland Chinese in Formosa should be repatriated to the mainland . . . Chiang and his lieutenants should be given asylum in some safe place."

Or, to put it in "liberal" terms: a suite at the Plaza for Chiang, the "reactionary dictator"; Red execution chambers for the canaille! "Neutralizing" other people's islands and dispatching the inhabitants back to the Communist terror from which they fled appeal to liberals as just what the doctor ordered to "commit" those Uncommitted Peoples.

Well, if liberals could think logically or had any sympathy for the common man, they wouldn't be liberals. If they could think logically, they wouldn't describe the crime of Jimmy Wilson, recently reprieved from death by the Governor of Alabama, as "the theft of $1.95." The crime, of course, was armed robbery and attempted rape, and the accused had a long record. The fact that the victim had only $1.95 on her when attacked has nothing to do with it. And yet a pair of pious parsons from Sayre, Pa., writing to the *New York Herald Tribune*, described the crime as "piffling." I'm not enthusiastic about the death penalty for robbery, and I'm glad that Jimmy escaped the noose, or whatever they do them in with in Alabama. But to charge, as these clerics do, that "human life, in America herself, is cheaper than $1.95" is to conceal the issue in a fog of false sentimentality.

AS TO LOGIC, you might expect Harvard, the seat of Royce, James and Santayana, to have a monopoly or at least a controlling interest, in that field. But Harvard graduates who read the appeals from the Program for Harvard College think they detect a few gaps. Answering the question "How much shall I give to John Harvard?" one brochure suggests that the loyal alumnus should give at the minimum the difference between what he paid to go to Harvard and what it cost Harvard to have him there. But, it is added, there is a big difference between the dollars in vogue, say in 1915, and those we have now. Thus, if Harvard invested $1000 in a '15 man, the amount needed to replace that investment in 1957 dollars would be $2770—probably more in 1958. Why shouldn't the alumnus pay the difference?

There are plenty of Harvard bankers and insurance executives who understand what inflation has done to them and could do to the vast Harvard endowment. But to hear the Keynesians in the Harvard economics department tell it, you'd think the Beat Dollar was the fiscal triumph of the century, and that in gratitude any Harvard man worth his salt should be glad to pay $2770 for a $1000 debt—interest not figured in. As one Crimson graduate put it, "I'm supposed to shore up the damage to Harvard caused by inflation, when the kids up there are taught that inflation is wonderful!"

One could go on with this sort of thing for pages and pages. For example, why haven't the people who are always worrying about how thissa or thatta will affect America's reputation abroad become alarmed about the debate in *The New York Times*' letter columns on how to handle the growing habit of throwing garbage out the window onto the roof of the next apartment house? The "Ashamed-to-Hold-Up-Our-Heads-Abroad" group is always

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worrying about what foreigners will think of segregation. But the spectacle of Puerto Ricans skimming banana peels out the window doesn't worry them at all.

You might know the "educationists" would go gunning for Roger Freeman's book, *School Needs in the Decade Ahead,* which exposed the more fraudulent claims of the Federal subsidy lobby. But you wouldn't expect the American Association of School Administrators to use the kind of "spider web chart" tactics which they usually condemn when used by their opponents. Thus in an AASA release of August 29, 1958, it is said that the title of Mr. Freeman's book and the name of its sponsor (Institute For Social Science Research) "give it an air of respectability"—as if it were otherwise disreputable. On Freeman himself, the release states: "Reports in this office indicate that his formal education was not acquired in American schools." (He ain't a 100 per cent American, eh?) This probably is not intended to explain Freeman's failure to appreciate the need for courses in dating, but rather to indicate that Mr. Freeman has not understood many of "the values which underpin America's democratic government and our universal school system."

In short, according to an anonymous reviewer quoted by the Administrators, Freeman has written a book which will appeal to "the person who is so preoccupied with money or so opposed to public education that he will go to any length to restrict public support for education."

Toynbee didn't mention a decline in taste as a premonitory symptom of creeping national decay. But with the cinema featuring Monsters from Outer Space and bosom-happy girls of the Beat Generation with half-witted expressions and anterior motives, you can make the beginning of a Federal case of it. Certainly Senator Anderson of New Mexico didn't do much for the defense. Upon learning that Admiral Rickover hadn't been invited to a White House affair because there was "no room," Anderson enlightened his fellow Senators by quoting from Luke's Gospel, second chapter, seventh verse. It reads: "And she brought forth her first-born son and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn."

There must be occasions when even an atom-minded Admiral wishes he had remained obscure!

PEEKING INTO the "show window of democracy" must confuse the lesser breeds without the law, as they crane their necks to see what liberal principles look like in actual operation, as opposed to how they sound on a US Information Service broadcast. A Supreme Court handing down decisions before there is any case might look suspiciously like the familiar "peoples' court" in which you can predict the verdict before any evidence has appeared. If I were an underfed, half-clad Uncommitted Person, withered by opium and stained with betel nut juice, I might wonder why in a great democracy the people had permitted nine men to grab so much power.

* * *

Of course, the decline of great civilizations has usually been illuminated by the flaming words of major and minor prophets who did their best to tip off their contemporaries to disaster ahead, and usually landed in lions' dens or fiery furnaces for their trouble. Contemporary America is getting a stiff going-over from the jawbones of asses in high places. However, out of the tumult emerged one really good maxim, and it came, to nobody's great surprise, from Vice President Nixon. He said things were coming to a pretty pass if you had to decide important matters by the weight of the mail instead of the weight of the evidence. This one really rocked Lippmann, who accused Nixon of "making reckless and unfounded accusations against innocent men"—the innocents being the State Department functionaries who fell in with a propaganda effort to blitz the State Department with a shower of stimulated demands that we give up Quemoy.

Just the same, Nixon's *mot* deserves a long life as a vest-pocket criticism of one of the worst of our national disorders, slavish acceptance of "mass opinion," however ignobly conceived and however misguided.

And, while we're on the State Department, it seems a good opportunity to conclude this jeremiad with the prize exhibit in innocence of recent origin. It is a question by an unnamed journalist addressed to Mr. Dulles during his historic press conference:

"Mr. Secretary, do you really mean to leave the impression that someone in the Department was subversive? I mean do you really feel—I mean is that your honest opinion? In other words, if you had no specific evidence, that that is true?"

Now really, how COULD such an idea occur to ANYBODY?

Frederic Nelson is a Senior Editor of the *Saturday Evening Post,* in charge of the editorial page. He won the Freedoms Foundation Award, for an editorial, in 1951. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "What Would a 'Preventive War' Prevent?" January 27, 1958.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "LEFT-WING FOLLIES: 1958 VERSION," at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED